

COMMENT SET 16

Environmental Impact Report
Reporter's Transcript of Proceedings

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

PUBLIC HEARING
OF A DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
PRC-421 REVISED PIER REMOVAL PROJECT

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS,
taken at 5679 Hollister Avenue, Goleta, California,
commencing at 6:15 p.m., on Wednesday, February 18,
2004, before TAMARA LOWEN, CSR NO. 8935.

FILE NO. 62516

Pacific Coast Court Reporters
805 644 1086

Environmental Impact Report
Reporter's Transcript of Proceedings

1 APPEARANCES:

2 For State of California, State Lands Commission:
3 STATE OF CALIFORNIA
4 BY: ERIC L. GILLIES
5 Staff Environmental Scientist
6 100 Howe Avenue, Suite 100-South
7 Sacramento, California 95825
8 (916) 574-1897

9 For Padre Associates:

10 PADRE ASSOCIATES, INC.
11 BY: SIMON A. POULTER
12 Principal/Environmental Sciences Group
13 5951 Emery Road, Suite 110
14 Goleta, California 93117
15 (805) 983-1233
16 --- and ---
17 PADRE ASSOCIATES, INC.
18 BY: DONNA M. HEBERT
19 Project Manager
20 1861 Knoll Drive
21 Ventura, California 91003
22 (805) 644-2220

23 Also Present:

24 DAVID SANOSTER
25 MARK BREKHUIS
MICHELLE PASINI, Fairweather Pacific
ANTHONY BROWN, ARCO
JOHN LORENTZ, Fairweather Pacific
DAN CUMMINGS
NICOLE HORN
JENNIFER RAGLAND, Hannah-Beth Jackson's Office
JENNIFER STROH, Santa Barbara Audubon Society
DAN ANCOYA
INGE COX, M D

1 And then we also have a court reporter here.
2 so if you do speak, speak loudly enough that she could
3 record your comments.
4 Other than that, I'll leave it to --
5 MR. POULTER: And state your name and --
6 MR. GILLIES: Yeah. State your name and
7 affiliation.
8 And with that, I'll leave it to Donna.
9 MR. POULTER: Donna.
10 MS. HEBERT: Thanks.
11 How many in the audience have had a chance to
12 actually review the environmental documents? Great. So
13 this is going to be a review the whole thing.
14 At any rate, next slide, Simon, please.
15 The purpose of this meeting is to just give an
16 overview of the project, to summarize the findings of
17 the Draft Environmental Impact Report. We're not going
18 to get into the mitigation measures, however, just to
19 make this a relatively short meeting instead of an
20 all-night meeting.
21 And then, as already mentioned, the main
22 purpose is really to take your comments. We're willing
23 to take written comments throughout the comment period,
24 of course. And we'll be addressing them in the final
25 Environmental Impact Report.

2

4

1 GOLETA, CALIFORNIA, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 2004,
2 6:15 P.M.

3 ---GO---

4 MR. GILLIES: Welcome, everybody. I'm Eric
5 Gillies of the State Lands Commission. I am the project
6 manager for the PRC Pier Removal Project.
7 And we've waited 15 minutes to let any
8 lingering people come in. We may hopefully get some
9 more.

10 If you haven't already, there's a sign-up
11 sheet up here. If you haven't, sign out before you
12 leave. There's also a speaker list, a slip. If you'd
13 like to speak, fill that out. Or if you want to just
14 provide comments -- provide your comments -- written
15 comments on that speaker slip.

16 On my right here is Simon Poulter. He's the
17 project manager for Padre Associates, who's helped put
18 the document together, and Donna Hebert, as well, is a
19 project manager. And they'll be presenting the project
20 to you this evening. And then following the
21 presentation, feel free to provide comments -- oral
22 comments to us, and we'll take them down and make note
23 of them.

3

1 Next slide.
2 The objectives of the project are to remove a
3 severely deteriorated structure that exists which would
4 eliminate possible harm to the public to comply with the
5 State Lands Commission's requirement for abandonment of
6 oil and gas facilities; also to construct a roosting and
7 nesting habitat and provide additional hard-bottom
8 substrate for marine organisms.
9 Next slide.
10 The parties involved in the project as far as
11 CEQA, the lead agency, is concerned, is the State Lands
12 Commission; the applicant is Arco; responsible agencies
13 include California Coastal Commission, the Regional
14 Water Quality Control Board; and the California
15 Department of Fish and Game as a trustee agency for this
16 project.
17 Maps don't come out that great, but we all
18 know where the project location is because we're
19 practically there. It's just offshore. And this is a
20 historic photograph. I'm not exactly sure what the date
21 of the photo is. But this is the original pier complex
22 that the pier remnant is a portion of.
23 Next slide.
24 This is a current view of the remnants. It's
25 showing that it is highly used by marine birds. And

5

2 (Pages 2 to 5)

Pacific Coast Court Reporters
805 644 1086

Environmental Impact Report
Reporter's Transcript of Proceedings

1 this is not very easily seen here, but it's just kind of
2 an indicator of some of the other piling remnants that
3 would have been subsurface.
4 The project includes retention of the caissons
5 once they've been toppled through the use of explosives.
6 The idea is to nest them, which is what this diagram
7 shows, and then quarry rock would be imported to the
8 site and put within this area of the toppled caissons.
9 Next slide, please.
10 This is a figure of the proposed bird roosting
11 platform, just to give you an idea of the size and
12 shape. There would be the quarry rock providing
13 stabilization at the bottom, basically a tall pile with
14 three trapezoidal members here that would provide the
15 actual roosting platform for the birds. And the design
16 would be -- is to make it high enough to be above the
17 100-year wave height.
18 Next slide, please.
19 This figure, as well as that large blowup over
20 there, just gives you an idea of the size of the
21 proposed roosting platforms in comparison to the remnant
22 right now. And as you can see, there are four of them
23 that are proposed. They are slightly higher than the
24 existing pier structure.
25 Okay. This is just a simulation of one

6

1 there were no Class 1 impacts, which are impacts that
2 cannot be mitigated to a less than significant level.
3 So that's a good thing.
4 Second slide -- next slide.
5 Class 2 impacts that are associated with the
6 project are impacts that require some sort of mitigation
7 in order to get them to a level of less than
8 significant, that means below a certain threshold that
9 we've used in evaluating the project. And they are in
10 the areas of transportation, because the project, just
11 like the existing structure, would create -- is a
12 navigational hazard. There are health hazards
13 associated with the use of explosives. Construction
14 noise would be significant only during the pile driving
15 phase. And that's pretty good. Those were the Class 2
16 impacts.
17 Now we have Class 3 impacts, which are those
18 that are considered less than significant. They're
19 adverse, but they didn't meet a certain threshold
20 criteria, so they're considered to be less than
21 significant. No mitigation is necessary. However, the
22 project actually includes a lot of mitigations. It's
23 been built into it. So some of these issues are
24 actually addressed by the project itself in its design,
25 which, if you have had the chance to look at the EIR, a

8

1 particular structure showing, again, the three different
2 platforms.
3 Next slide, please.
4 This just gives you -- it's odd how it comes
5 out so orange. This just shows you what a typical view
6 is. This particular view is from the Bacara Resort.
7 But in most cases, views from the shore of the structure
8 are fairly distant even though it's about 850 or so feet
9 offshore.
10 Next slide, please.
11 This slide is the same as that board over
12 there. And this is a computer simulation of what the
13 project would look like after it's been constructed.
14 And it sort of looks like there's three platforms there,
15 but it's because of the orientation of that particular
16 view. There's really four. So, of course, just like
17 with the oil and gas platforms offshore, depending on
18 where you are down the coast, sometimes they look like
19 they're all in one straight line; and then in other
20 orientations you can see the distance between them.
21 And this diagram is in the EIR, as well as all
22 these other ones you have seen, if you want to
23 scrutinize it more closely.
24 Now onto the environmental impacts. The
25 findings of the environmental review determined that

7

1 lot of the appendices have the various plans in it, the
2 marine mammal mitigation plan, the oil spill contingency
3 plan and so forth.
4 Anyway, Class 3 impacts fall into the areas of
5 geology and coastal process effects, which means
6 transportation of sand, for example, and the wave -- the
7 size of waves. Air quality impacts, both during
8 construction and during the operation of the project,
9 would be less than significant. Transportation impacts,
10 which include the marine impacts from vessels offshore
11 as well as the onshore traffic would be less than
12 significant. Biological impacts having to do with the
13 use of the explosives and the impacts on marine mammals,
14 birds and so forth would be less than significant.
15 To continue on, we've got the temporary
16 impacts to the roosting habitat, because there would be
17 a short period of about a month or less between the time
18 when the existing structure is taken down and the new
19 roosting platforms can be put up.
20 There are -- there would be some marine water
21 quality impacts from construction, impact on hardbottom,
22 kelp and temporary impacts to fishing.
23 Hazard impacts are associated with diver
24 safety and possible introduction of contamination into
25 the environment. Again, the noise impacts other than

9

3 (Pages 6 to 9)

Environmental Impact Report
Reporter's Transcript of Proceedings

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>1 the pile driving are considered to be less than 2 significant. Short-term and long-term aesthetic impacts 3 will be equipment and vessels offshore during the 4 construction phase; and, of course, we'll have new 5 structures offshore to look at. Cultural resources, 6 there are no significant impacts there. 7 Next slide. Okay. Great. 8 Recreation. There would be temporary effects 9 on boaters, surfers and onshore recreation uses. 10 primarily associated with the visual impacts. 11 Turbidity. And with respect to environmental justice 12 status, looking at when a project occurs, is it going to 13 have an unusual effect to a minority populations or 14 economically disadvantaged populations, and that is not 15 going to be the case for this particular project. 16 Beneficial effects that were identified are 17 moderate commercial and recreational fishing benefits 18 from the introduction of a hard-bottom habitat at the 19 site. 20 The environmental document looked at the no 21 project alternative as well as the originally proposed 22 project, which was similar to this project except for it 23 did not include the construction of the bird roosting 24 platforms. 25 The no project alternative would still</p> <p style="text-align: right;">10</p> | <p>1 We wouldn't have the benefit to help because 2 of the additional substrate that -- as I just mentioned. 3 And we would not have this minor benefit to the 4 commercial and recreational fishing. 5 We'd avoid the significant -- the not 6 significant and the significant noise -- short-term 7 noise impacts. Beneficial long-term aesthetic impacts 8 would result because we wouldn't have a new structure 9 replacing the old structure. 10 Somehow we've -- I think we missed a slide or 11 we went through it so fast that I just missed it. 12 But, at any rate, there were -- insignificant 13 long-term air quality impacts wouldn't result under the 14 original project. And that's the only one that I 15 missed. 16 Okay. The next steps are to obtain comments 17 from you tonight, oral comments. We will take those 18 comments as well as the written comments and respond in 19 the final Environmental Impact Report. There will be 20 another hearing, a public hearing that the State Lands 21 Commission will have probably here in Goleta or will it 22 be in -- no? Will it be in Sacramento? 23 MR. GILLIES: Probably in Sacramento in April. 24 MS. HEBERT: Okay. 25 When they will consider the certification of</p> <p style="text-align: right;">12</p> |
| <p>1 continue to result in a hazard associated with the 2 deteriorating structure, those remains being offshore. 3 which eventually just continue to deteriorate and fall 4 apart and influence people that are using the ocean 5 resources. Other environmental impacts associated with 6 the construction and the removal of the existing 7 structure would be avoided. 8 The original project has basically similar 9 impacts as to this particular project, since most of the 10 impacts are associated with the construction and the 11 removal of the remnants. However, unavoidable loss of 12 valuable offshore roosting and nesting habitat would not 13 occur with the original project. This was identified as 14 a Class 1 unavoidable impact under the original project. 15 and that is one of the things that we would have now is 16 no Class 1 impact in that area. 17 The original project does avoid significant 18 mitigable impacts associated with the hazard to 19 navigation since the structure would be removed and no 20 new structure would be placed at the site. It precludes 21 the use of the toppled caissons for hard-bottom 22 substrate and the introduction of quarry rock, which 23 would provide habitat for marine resources. 24 That's interesting. The slides are different 25 than these. So I'll go with this.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">11</p> | <p>1 this environmental document. After that, the State 2 Lands Commission needs to consider approval of the 3 project. And that anticipated construction, if all is 4 approved, would be in 2000 and -- this year, in the 5 fall. 6 So now I've got -- we've only got one slip. 7 But does anybody else have a speaker slip that they want 8 to turn in? I just have one. 9 MR. GILLIES: Feel free. You don't have to 10 fill out a speaker slip to comment. So if you have any 11 comments, feel free to raise your hand and announce 12 yourself. So -- 13 MR. POULTER: And I will add that when you 14 make comments, if you could talk to the adequacy of the 15 environmental document. This is not a hearing to 16 discuss the appropriateness of the project. That 17 actually will be done at the next phase, when it's 18 before the State Lands Commission. 19 But what we are looking for right now is we 20 need comments on the environmental review document. And 21 any comments you have specific to a certain area, if you 22 could note that so that we could take that into the 23 record. 24 MS. RAGLAND: Can I ask you a question? It's 25 not a comment, but a question.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">13</p> |

4 (Pages 10 to 13)

Pacific Coast Court Reporters
805 644 1086

Environmental Impact Report
Reporter's Transcript of Proceedings

16R-1

1 MR. GILLIES: Yes.
2 MS. RAGLAND: I did review it, but I didn't
3 read the whole thing. But I'm wondering if the EIR
4 looked at whether the change in the height would effect
5 whether the birds would actually roost in the area.
6 I asked that at the scoping hearing, and I
7 think -- I never saw it in the EIR, but I did not read
8 the whole thing.
9 MS. HEBERT: No. Because that -- shall I go
10 ahead and address that or --
11 MR. GILLIES: Sure.
12 MS. HEBERT: It's just that that is not
13 considered to be an environmental impact of the project.
14 It's a design issue. And the California Department of
15 Fish and Game was involved in the design of the --
16 MS. RAGLAND: Okay.
17 MS. HEBERT: -- platforms.
18 MR. GILLIES: Yeah. And as far as the height,
19 we discussed it with Fish and Game, that particular
20 issue, and they felt the height was a -- had no bearing
21 on the birds using the structure.
22 MS. RAGLAND: Okay.
23 MR. GILLIES: So, yeah, that is a design
24 feature --
25 MS. RAGLAND: Right.

14

16H-1

1 MR. GILLIES: -- rather than -- it is a little
2 taller than the existing structure.
3 Go ahead.
4 MS. HORN: My name Nicole Horn. I'm from the
5 Santa Barbara County Energy Division. And I just had a
6 question about the well conductor pipe. I also reviewed
7 the Draft EIR, but I didn't fully read it, so I'm
8 wondering if maybe I missed a section talking about the
9 abandonment of the well conductor pipe. It called out
10 earlier that it would be abandoned, but I am wondering
11 what you mean by that if you're proposing to, you know,
12 set off the explosives similar to what you did with the
13 caissons or the --
14 MR. POULTER: No. The conductor will be cut,
15 but a replacement pipe will be put so that it could be
16 reentered if there was ever a problem with that well
17 that will top out at the -- at the edge of the riprap
18 that will be placed over the nested caissons. So it
19 will be mechanically cut, if I remember correctly, not
20 explosively cut. That will ensure reentry.
21 MR. GILLIES: David, you filled out a speaker
22 slip.
23 MR. SANGSTER: Sure. David Sangster. I'm a
24 resident of the Eliwood area. I'm -- I think the
25 alternative of cleaning up the site is probably a better

15

16S-1

1 idea. You know, if there's any useful material, it
2 should be cleaned and essentially dropped in another
3 area on the same lease or something, but not at that
4 site. The -- it seems like you should be looking at all
5 possible alternatives. And putting the bird roost at
6 that site -- again, the two reports said that mitigating
7 loss of the bird roost, you should put some bird roosts
8 in at a different location. I haven't seen any -- I
9 asked that in the first letter and I haven't seen an
10 answer why the consultant thought it should be at a
11 different location but it's now at that location.
12 It appears that the rocks in front of it could
13 have a shoaly effect on a large wave, which would
14 actually increase wave speed, you know, along the piles
15 Potentially the best thing for a pile would be a flat
16 bottom and no reef in front of it. The -- I agree,
17 also, they seem to be too high. And they're way up in
18 the full wind stream of the storms. The large surface
19 area will probably catch wind, it will probably vibrate
20 and swing fairly drastically in a large storm. I don't
21 know if you've done any wind tunnel tests of that
22 design, but impacts of the design, I guess, are impacts.
23 Another point of being that high is I've seen
24 helicopters fly lower than the cliff and small aircraft
25 fly lower than the bluff of the cliff. That's probably

16S-1

16S-2

16S-3

16S-4

16S-4

16S-5

1 higher than the bluff there. I'm not sure if you even
2 looked at the impact on commercial -- not commercial,
3 but private aircraft and helicopters. There's
4 helicopters that service the oil platforms regularly.
5 They don't fly that close to shore generally, but, you
6 know, I've seen craft that close. Or something in a fog
7 or night. I don't think there's any lights or anything.
8 It's a hazard to aircraft.
9 The -- going back to the main -- the current
10 proposal, the cleanup procedure's not clear, the
11 sequence. And if there's not a complete cleanup before
12 the caissons are toppled, there's a chance that debris
13 and other material will be essentially buried and left
14 behind by -- you know, buried by the caissons coming
15 down and there won't be a chance to clean it out before
16 the quarry rock goes in. The final cleanup that is
17 mentioned occurs after the quarry rock and the caissons
18 have been moved around. There's no preliminary cleanup
19 of all the debris fields that have been reported at that
20 site in the report.
21 Also, the pretty tight schedule calls for, you
22 know, everything being okay and working fast. If
23 water's not clear and there's poor visibility, might be
24 almost impossible to do a proper cleanup because it's a
25 very tight schedule and, you know, it's hard to see a

5 (Pages 14 to 17)

Pacific Coast Court Reporters
205 444 1086

Environmental Impact Report
Reporter's Transcript of Proceedings

16S-5

1 complete cleanup being effected.
2 It's not even in the report to do preliminary
3 cleanup before the caissons are dropped out. There's
4 some scouring around the caissons, but there are -- and
5 even in the report, in the appendix, there's reports of
6 I-beams and debris fields in close proximity to the
7 caissons.
8 Also in the report, on Page -- I think it's
9 1-10, at the bottom, they mention that using the same
10 equipment, surveyors will inspect and document the
11 removal and recovery of the seven debris targets
12 identified in the Refugio Seashore Feature Survey
13 conducted on March 10th, 1999.
14 And if you look at the back, at Appendix H,
15 five of those identified things are natural rocks. I'm
16 not sure why you're taking out natural bedrock, if
17 that's the case. I mean, that's -- the survey date of
18 that -- those pictures -- that survey in Appendix H was
19 March 1999. And you know, Locations No. 2, 3, 4, 5 and
20 6 are rocks that are identified on the survey; and all
21 targets were found to be natural formations with
22 exception of 1, 7 and 8. I'm not sure why they reported
23 eight and there's only seven in the report.
24 That same Appendix H also has all the --
25 mentions the debris fields and the debris and the

18

16S-6

1 I-beams around the actual structure. I'm not sure when
2 that material will be cleaned out. It's not clear in
3 the report when that will actually be taken out.
4 The executive summary is also not very clear
5 on Page 1-2. You have the removal of the caissons
6 essentially there in the executive summary. I mean, I
7 assume it's left over from the previous report, but I'm
8 not -- it's a little bit conflicting to leave them in
9 there and then remove them in the same executive
10 summary.

16S-7

1 I also had a question on whether -- due to the
2 condition of the caissons, whether they might just
3 topple over with some pushing and pulling and avoid
4 using the explosives. Some of them might come down
5 pretty much on their own. There might be one or two
6 that need some charge. Much more beneficial to, you
7 know, try to just knock them over first.
8 But, anyway, I'll be putting most of this
9 stuff in writing, too. But that's pretty much it.
10 MR. POULTER: Thank you for your comments.
11 MS. HORN: Can I just elaborate on that -- the
12 well conductor pipe?
13 MR. POULTER: Yes.
14 MS. HORN: Again, it's -- I am just trying to
15 find where it calls out in the Draft EIR the description

19

1 of the capping, I guess, of the pipe after it's been
2 cut. Is there a full description of what's being
3 proposed there or is it kind of just in the
4 Section 3.4.2, what's there? Is there another section?
5 MR. POULTER: I'll have to -- we'll have to
6 review that.
7 MS. HEBERT: Yeah. It's not like a
8 super-detailed description of it.
9 MR. GILLIES: Of the abandoned well?
10 MS. HEBERT: Yeah. Of the conductor pipe. I
11 mean, it's covered in there, but I'm not sure --
12 MS. HORN: Okay.
13 MS. HEBERT: -- what is --
14 MR. POULTER: May actually be more detail in
15 the appendix. But we can get you that information.
16 MR. SANGSTER: They actually cut it off and
17 then they leave that space open. They're not covering
18 it up.
19 MS. HORN: I think someone just mentioned that
20 they were gonna cap it.
21 MR. GILLIES: Well, it's been; right?
22 MS. HORN: Okay.
23 MR. POULTER: It's been plugged and abandoned.
24 MR. GILLIES: Yeah. That was in the '50s, was
25 it?

20

16H-2

1 MS. HEBERT: Uh-huh.
2 MR. POULTER: But we'll -- we can get you that
3 information.
4 MS. HORN: All right. Thanks. That's it.
5 MR. POULTER: Any other comments?
6 Come on, you said something last time.
7 MS. RAGLAND: I am going to submit it in
8 writing. Is tomorrow the last day?
9 MR. GILLIES: No. It's March 11th. And,
10 actually, there was a mistake on it. I have it Monday,
11 March 11th, but actually it's a Thursday.
12 MS. RAGLAND: Okay.
13 MS. STROH: Can you answer any questions here
14 or would it be better --
15 MR. GILLIES: We can answer some questions.
16 MS. STROH: I am just curious on one part.
17 where the marine mammals will be monitored from land
18 when the quarry is added. I was just wondering why
19 it's -- the monitor is from land -- is on land and
20 not --
21 MR. GILLIES: What page is that on?
22 MS. STROH: -- and not on a vessel. It's
23 4.4-46.
24 MS. HEBERT: What is your name, by the way,
25 please?

21

16ST-1

6 (Pages 18 to 21)

Pacific Coast Court Reporters
805.644.1986

Environmental Impact Report
Reporter's Transcript of Proceedings

16ST-2

1 MS. STROH: Jennifer Stroh, from the Audubon
2 Society.
3 MR. GILLIES: Okay. I've talked to you on the
4 phone.
5 MS. HEBERT: Yeah. Because I'm assuming that
6 this is a question that -- it came from what's being
7 proposed by the applicant. We're not the folks
8 proposing it. And so I would be surprised -- I wouldn't
9 answer the question as to why that strategy was taken,
10 you know, aerial versus boats at this time. So it might
11 be something that is better addressed in response to
12 comments.
13 MR. POULTER: Yeah. If you would put that
14 into a comment, we can certainly give you a response
15 that will be provided through the marine mammal
16 consultant.
17 MS. STROH: Okay.
18 MR. POULTER: Well, what we'll do, I guess, is
19 we'll wait a little bit more time, if anybody else shows
20 up and has any comments. If there are specific
21 questions you have, please feel free to put them into
22 writing. We'll be hanging around and kind of waiting to
23 see if there was any additional comments, but --
24 MR. GILLIES: Or more people showing up.
25 MS. STROH: Do you know the life expectancies

22

1 wasn't here due to budget. You know, their travel's
2 been cut quite a bit. But I can give you the biologist
3 that has been working on that so that you can get in
4 contact with him.
5 MR. POULTER: I found your answer. 3-23,
6 second full paragraph down.
7 MS. HORN: Okay. Thanks.
8 MR. POULTER: I knew it was in there.
9 Thanks, everybody, for your comments and
10 attestation.
11 (Proceedings are suspended at 6:45 p.m.)
12 (Ms. Cox enters the proceedings and the
13 presentation is gone over again.)
14 (7:25 P.M.)
15 ---o0o---
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

24

16ST-3

1 for the new roosting platform?
2 MR. GILLIES: It's designed for a 25-year plus
3 life expectancy. And that's something we're working out
4 with Fish and Game right now with the maintenance of it
5 over that 25-year period. The first five years, it's
6 supposed to be basically maintenance free, and then some
7 minor maintenance as time goes on, and monitoring of how
8 well the piers stand up.
9 MS. STROH: And would that maintenance also
10 include possibly monitoring the different bird species
11 that ended up roosting there and nesting there or
12 possibly migrants?
13 MR. GILLIES: I would hope -- that hasn't been
14 discussed. But I think Fish and Game, they see it as
15 a -- you know, as an important bird location, so I think
16 they would be monitoring or have at least some type of
17 monitoring of what birds are using it. I'm not sure
18 what resources they have to do that as far as a
19 structure monitoring program for that. But that hasn't
20 been formally proposed.
21 MS. STROH: Okay.
22 MR. GILLIES: Actually, that may be something
23 a local -- the Audubon Society could do, you know, is
24 monitor what birds are using it after construction and
25 how successful it is. Unfortunately, Fish and Game

23

7 (Pages 22 to 24)

Pacific Coast Court Reporters
805 644.1986

Response to Comments Received During the Hearing on the DEIR - Wednesday, February 18, 2004

Commenting Party: Jennifer Ragland

Responses to Comment(s):

16R-1. The response to the question was provided immediately and is contained in lines 12-21 on page 14 of the transcript itself.

Commenting Party: Nicole Horn, Santa Barbara County Energy Division

Responses to Comment(s):

16H-1. The question is partially answered within lines 14-20 on page 15 of the transcript. DEIR Section 3.4.2, Toppling of the Caisson Structures, of the DEIR states that using divers and LLB equipment, sediment surrounding the well conductor pipe will be jetted, and the conductor pipe will be cut by the diver using a cutting torch and removed to one foot below the mudline. Later in the DEIR section it is stated that prior to installing the piles, the LLB will be moved shoreward on its anchors and the divers will remove any visible remnant pier pilings and debris and cut off the nearshore well conductor. The rock pile surrounding the well conductor will be left as hard bottom substrate. All protruding sheet pile from the rock pile that would remain will be removed.

16H-2. Please refer to HAZ-3 on page 4.5-4, first paragraph, for information about well abandonment of the two production wells. The last paragraph in Section 3.4.4, Hardbottom Substrate Construction, on page 3-23 of the DEIR describes the treatment of the interior well conductor in that portion of the lease affected by such construction.

Commenting Party: David Sangster

Responses:

16S-1. Please see Response to Comment 14-3 of the David Sangster letter in response to the DEIR.

16S-2. Please see Response to Comment 14-4 of the David Sangster letter in response to the DEIR.

16S-3. Please see Response to Comment 14-7 of the David Sangster letter in response to the DEIR. Bengal Engineering provided the structural design for the bird roosting/nesting platforms in their report dated November 2003, and it is provided as part of ARCO's permit application filed with the CSLC (available upon request from the CSLC). The design took into consideration wind loading as well as

other loading factors (dead load, live load, wave forces and seismic loading). Wind loading was calculated based on API RP-2A criteria (Section 2.3.2c). Wind speed of 75 knots was used and the total wind force on the structure was calculated to be 3,138 pounds.

16S-4. Please see Response to Comment 14-8 of the David Sangster letter in response to the DEIR.

16S-5. Please see Response to Comment 14-2 of the David Sangster letter in response to the DEIR.

16S-6. Please see above reference.

16S-7. Please see Response to Comment 14-6 of the David Sangster letter in response to the DEIR.

Commenting Party: Jennifer Stroh

Responses:

16ST-1. Please refer to Response to Comment 13-3 of the letter of Jennifer Stroh in response to the DEIR.

16ST-2. Please refer to Response to Comment 13-4 of the letter of Jennifer Stroh in response to the DEIR.

16ST-3. Please refer to Response to Comment 13-5 of the letter of Jennifer Stroh in response to the DEIR.